



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/547,848	02/13/2006	Uwe Vogt	CH-8394/LeA 36449	1093

7590 12/24/2008
Jill Denesvich
Laxness Corporation
Law & Intellectual Property Department
111 Ride Park West Drive
Pittsburgh, PA 15275-1112

EXAMINER

DELCOTTO, GREGORY R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/547,848	Applicant(s) VOGT ET AL.	
	Examiner Gregory R. Del Cotto	Art Unit 1796	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-38 are pending. Note that, the Examiner would like to point out that claims 4-7 and 11-38 are improper multiple dependent claims in that they are multiple dependent claims which are dependent upon other multiple dependent claims.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-30, drawn to an oxidizing system.

Group II, claim(s) 31, drawn to a process for oxidizing oxidizable substances.

Group III, claim(s) 32 and 33, drawn to a process for removing excess unfixed dye from textile materials after dyeing.

Group IV, claim(s) 34, drawn to a dyed material.

Group V, claim(s) 35, drawn to a process for removing colored impurities from industrial wastewater.

Group VI, claim(s) 36, drawn to wastewater.

Group VII, claim(s) 37, drawn to a process for lightening colored impurities on solid materials.

Group VIII, claim(s) 38, drawn to solid materials.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VIII do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Claim 1, at least, is anticipated by or obvious over Vogt et al (US 6,380,142) in view of Collins et al (US 5,853,428) or Collins et al (US 5,853,428) in view of Vogt et al (US 6,380,142).

Art Unit: 1796

Consequently, the technical feature which links claims 1-38, an oxidizing system containing a macrocyclic metal complex, an oxidizing agent, and an oxidation-enhancing compound, does not provide a contribution over the prior art, so unity of invention is lacking

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

1. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (I).
2. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (II).
3. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (III).
4. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (IV).
5. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (V).
6. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (VI).
7. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (VII).
8. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (VIII).
9. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (IX).
10. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (X).
11. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XI).
12. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XII).
13. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XIII).

Art Unit: 1796

14. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XIV).

15. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XV).

16. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XVI).

17. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XVII).

18. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XVIII).

19. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XIX).

20. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XX).

21. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXI).

22. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXII).

23. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXIII).

24. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XIV).

Art Unit: 1796

25. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXV).

26. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXVI).

27. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXVII).

28. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXVIII).

29. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXIX).

30. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXX).

31. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXXI).

32. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXXII).

33. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXXIII).

34. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXXIV).

35. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXXV).

Art Unit: 1796

36. Embodiments wherein the oxidation-enhancing compound is of Formula (XXXVI).

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Specifically, Applicant is required to elect one of Formulas (I) thru Formula (XXXVI) as the elected species. For instance, the election of Formula (I) would be an appropriate election. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

All species correspond to claims 1-12 and claims 31-38. Depending upon the elected species, claims 13-30 may or may not correspond to the elected species

The following claim(s) are generic: 1.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Pursuant to PCT Rule 13.2 and PCT Administrative Instructions, Annex B, Part 1(f)(I)(B)(2), the species are not art recognized equivalents.

A telephone call was made to Jennifer Seng on December 17, 2008, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory R. Del Cotto whose telephone number is (571) 272-1312. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. thru Fri. from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1796

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory R. Del Cotto/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/G. R. D./
December 21, 2008